

Government Affairs
State Public Policy
Industry Information



Partnerships
Trade Services
Retailer Services

Environmental Committee Testimony

By Stan Sorkin, President

Connecticut Food Association

Monday, February 2, 2009

Testimony in Opposition to RB-661 & RB- 662

Good afternoon, Chairman Roy, Chairman Meyer and Members of the Environmental Committee. My name is Stan Sorkin, President of the Connecticut Food Association. Our Association provides policy advice, research, legislative and regulatory services to the grocery industry in the state. I am here today to testify in opposition to both **RB-661, An Act Expanding the Beverage Container Redemption Provisions to Include Non- Carbonated Beverages** and **R-662, An Act Expanding the Beverage Container Redemption Provisions to Include Water Bottles.**

Over the years, our Association has testified that:

- An expanded bottle bill is an outdated 1970's approach to a litter issue and does not achieve a 21st century solution to the total recycling goals of the state that an expanded single stream curbside program achieves.
- Expanding deposits to additional containers is over 40 times more expensive than recycling these containers curbside.
- Supermarkets lose 2-4cents per container on every container handled and expansion would only increase these costs as well as require additional space. These costs will be passed onto consumers in the form of higher prices.
- Requiring consumers to store and return bottles is inconvenient, unsanitary, and time consuming.

But, these current versions of the expansion bills require me to comment on the specific provisions of the bills. The 10 cent deposit would lead to over redemption, create incentives for fraud, and make Connecticut supermarkets the garbage dumps for bottles from our border states-New York, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island. This money would come directly out of the unclaimed nickels that the